

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 597

JC 820 144

AUTHOR Burnham, Peter F.
 TITLE Academic Standards Task Force Report.
 INSTITUTION Tompkins-Cortland Community Coll., Groton, N.Y.
 PUB DATE 81
 NOTE 18p.
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *College Planning; Community Colleges; Educational Philosophy; Grade Point Average; *Grading; Policy Formation; *School Policy; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The product of a year-long research process undertaken by a Task Force on Academic Standards at Tompkins Cortland Community College (TCCC) in 1980-81, this report provides background to the deliberations of the Task Force and a presentation of their position on academic standards at TCCC. The report establishes the Task Force's commitments to quality education; consistency in measurement of academic standards; responsibility and accountability on the part of student and teacher; provision of clear information to students; and responsibility for students' total development. With these commitments as a context, the report provides 20 recommendations on academic standards covering the following areas: alternative time plans for course completion; evaluation of course requirements and basic skills prerequisites; provision of basic skills resources; filing of master syllabi; development of course outlines; establishment of consistent student evaluation practices and grading policies; commitment to proficiency examinations; development of new procedures for adding courses, course withdrawals, and final exams; elimination of "Y" (non-attendance) grades; retention of a plus and minus grading system; inclusion of "NC" (incomplete) as part of students' grade point averages; inclusion of all grades on student transcripts; repetition of courses; an academic warning system; student re-entry into programs; and consistent procedures for graduation requirements. (HB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED214597

ACADEMIC STANDARDS TASK FORCE REPORT

By: Dr. Peter F. Burnham

Tompkins-Cortland Community College
Spring 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter F. Burnham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
- ☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

JC 820144

INTRODUCTION

The Final Report of the Task Force on Academic Standards is the culmination of a year-long process which involved numerous individuals examining a wide range of issues and problems. The Task Force held twenty-one general meetings; the three subcommittees met for many additional hours. On an individual basis, there was a great deal of reading and research. Yet, to capture fully the essence of this process, one would have to have participated in one of the numerous debates that marked the highly professional, educationally stimulating give-and-take that built the unanimous recommendations of this report. It was during these dialogues that much of the philosophy of this group crystallized. Yet, this report is more than the consensus of eighteen professionals; it seriously attempts to capture the essence of what Tompkins Cortland Community College represents as an academic institution. The Task Force truly believes that "education" is our number one business, and this report seeks to strengthen and clarify that commitment.

At its first meeting, August 28, 1980, the Task Force was divided into three subcommittees which were charged by Dean Peter Burnham to investigate and make recommendations on approximately fifteen issues relating to Academic Standards and Policy.

Subcommittee #1 - Subcommittee on Policies

Grading	Dan Pukstas, Chairman
Attendance	Lucille Baker
Academic Difficulty	Chet Duck/Richard Bayer/Jane Pillow
Transfer Evaluation	Judy Cain
Withdrawal	Carl Haynes
Residency Requirements	Joe Dabes
Proficiency Exams	Agnes Donovan

Subcommittee #2 - Curricular Issues

General Education Exposure	Charles Shafer, Chairman
Basic Skills Competency	Gary MacDowell
Minimum Graduation Requirements	Marlene Blumin
	Pat Bence

Subcommittee #3 - Subcommittee on Course and Program Standards

Grading Policies	Carol Morris, Chairman
Course Objectives/Course Syllabi	Emma Schutz
Evaluation Practices	Nancy Lieberman
Final Exams	Joyce Damery
Academic Integrity/Cheating/Plagiarism	

These subcommittees developed procedures within their small working groups and conducted research through a variety of techniques including the use of ERIC and surveys of both faculty and students. The data gathered by the subcommittees and the information gleaned from the literature, as well as the recommendations made by the subcommittees to the Task Force, are all available for review. Since this material now fills a three-inch-thick file, it is too cumbersome to duplicate.

Once a subcommittee report was received, with specific recommendations, the Task Force then reacted to it with the subcommittee members serving as advocates for a particular recommendation. This deliberative process involved considerable consensus building. In the process, the diverse educational, professional, experiential and disciplinary backgrounds of the members clearly served as a microcosm for the entire professional community: advocates would become "devil's advocates"; "tips of icebergs" would become mountains, or melt; shoes would be put on other feet while some feet would be inserted in mouths. Pedagogy gave way to platitudes and philosophy became dogma; yet, through it all, the level of discussion remained professional, stimulating, and ultimately, educational for all. The building of consensus was the objective, and votes were taken on all recommendations. Close votes signaled a need for greater analysis.

In December, 1980, the Task Force distributed its interim report (for discussion) at an open forum with professional staff in January, 1981. As a result of suggestions and reactions expressed by staff at that forum, the Task Force began to review each of the recommendations again. This process culminated in the development of the final report in April, 1981. The Task Force hopes that all interested individuals will review this report and comment at a special open forum on June 11, 1981, from 9:00 - 12:00 p.m. The report is being submitted through the College Senate for approval. A request will be made to hold a special Senate meeting after June 11, 1981, to vote on and to amend the document if necessary. The Task Force only requests that amendments, if offered, be in writing and accompanied by a complete rationale.

At its final meeting, the Task Force on Academic Standards reflected on the process and the principles by which this report came to be. In our judgment, the best way to "frame" or put the recommendations into perspective is to review what it is we believe as a Task Force about Academic Standards at Tompkins Cortland Community College.

We Believe:

- That the College must, first and foremost, maintain a quality level of educational experience.

- That all the values of an educational experience cannot always be measured, but those that can, must be measured consistently and with the highest degree of integrity.
- That academic achievement directly reflects the standards established to measure that achievement.
- That the nomenclature of the academic world is based on transcripts, grades and documentation of learning, and the integrity of this universal language must be maintained.
- That the student's academic transcript reflects achievement, successful or unsuccessful, and that the record of achievement, the transcript, should mirror the student's accomplishments.
- That part of the learning process in higher education is building, both in the student and in the teacher, a sense of responsibility and accountability.
- That Tompkins Cortland Community College, by its mission and goals, is committed to demonstrable growth.
- That there is a moral and legal responsibility to be clear, honest and unambiguous in our academic expectations and standards:
- That at Tompkins Cortland Community College there is a commitment to teaching people to learn, and not just to accumulate knowledge; thus, standards must deal with process, not just information.
- That we have a commitment to the quality of the student who leaves here and goes on, as well as an ethical obligation to the student who is here.
- That the institution and the faculty must strive to maintain excellence and integrity in programs; otherwise, the institution's reputation and its future, as well as the well-being of all its students - past, present and future - will suffer.
- That the teacher is, by definition, the ultimate basis for the maintenance of academic standards. And, that the teacher, therefore, has first responsibility to clarify academic standards to students.
- That the experience of education, in terms of success and failure, is an important part of the learning process.
- That a nonpunitive grading system is, in fact, often "punitive" to the student who works hard and achieves a C or D while the student who gives up is not affected by the NC grade.

- That any grading system should strive for balance and equity while maintaining consistency.
- That this institution is the "second chance" institution for many, and grading practices should encourage students to overcome their fears and limitations; yet, the system should be neither deceptive nor patronizing.
- That maintenance of strong and consistent Academic Standards is one of the most important responsibilities an educational institution has to its multiple constituencies: students, employers, other educational institutions, and the taxpayers who support the institution's existence.

In conclusion, we would like to express our appreciation to Shirley Allen who diligently kept minutes and organized our papers, to the suite secretaries who helped so much in arranging meetings and getting typed material together, to the people in the Word Processing Center who kept the paper moving, to the library staff who helped with research, and to Chet Duck and Rich Bayer who, while "Registraring," played vital roles in the deliberations of the Task Force.

There is no question that this job is not done; there are still some issues which need to be addressed, and we hope the standing committee on Academic Standards will address them. They include:

- The hiring of faculty and its impact on Academic Standards
- Evaluation of teaching as it relates to Academic Standards
- Off-campus sites and the maintenance of standards
- Waiver and degree audit procedures
- Cheating and plagiarism (Note: this issue is currently under review by the Dean of Students)

More than anything else, it remains the responsibility of each teacher, administrator, and student to maintain and guarantee the highest academic standards for TC3. Without the integrity of these standards, our role as an academic institution is in serious jeopardy.

Lucille Baker
 Pat Bence
 Marlene Blumin
 Peter Burnham
 Judy Cain
 Joyce Darnery
 Agnes Donovan
 Chet Duck/Rich Bayer/Jane Pillow
 Carl Haynes
 Nancy Lieberman
 Gary MacDowell
 Carol Morris
 Dan Pukstas
 Emma Schutz
 Charles Shafer

May 22, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>Page</u>
One - Alternative Time Plans	1
Two - Course Requirement Interfacing	1
Three - Prerequisite Basic Skills	1
Four - Basic Skills Resources	2
Five - Master Syllabus	2
Six - Course Outline	3
Seven - Evaluation Practices	4
Eight - Grading Policies	5
Nine - Proficiency Exams	5
Ten - Adding a Course	6
Eleven - Elimination of Y Grade	7
Twelve - Course Withdrawal	7
Thirteen - Final Exams	7
Fourteen - Retention of Plus and Minus Grading System	8
Fifteen - NC Included in Computation of QPI	8
Sixteen - Transcript as Permanent Record	9
Seventeen - Repeating Courses	9
Eighteen - Academic Warning System	10
Nineteen - Consistency of Program Graduation Requirements	11
Twenty - Program Re-entry	11

Special Note: The order of these recommendations does not reflect a priority ranking; rather, they are according to when they would occur in a student's experience.

Recommendation 1 - Alternative Time Plans

Alternative time plans to the four semester plan as displayed to the student in the TC3 literature should be presented in the advisement process. Emphasis should be placed on the fact that students have an option of more than 4 semesters to complete their degree program, if necessary.

Rationale:

Many TC3 students are pursuing a degree but, because of basic skills deficiencies, should not be trying to take a high number of courses and credits during a given semester, particularly if they are trying simultaneously to eliminate those basic skills deficiencies. Although the student should have the opportunity to complete the degree within four semesters of time, if the student elects to move at a slower pace in order to guarantee success and to overcome basic skills deficiencies, this option should be made clear to the student through the advisement process.

Recommendation 2 - Course Requirement Interfacing

Course requirements need to be reviewed by faculty and Division Heads to evaluate the type of work required in all courses being taken concurrently within a program. There should be an effort to maintain realistic requirements. (For example, research papers are required during the first semester in the Accounting and BUAD programs; however, English 101, which teaches the research paper skill, is not taken until the second semester.)

Rationale:

Students sometimes are required to demonstrate competency in skills which are assumed by the instructor and yet taught in a subsequent course; the result is frustration for the student as well as the instructor. Although it may not be possible in all cases to establish a hierarchy of skills development within a four semester time frame, it is worthwhile for all Division Heads and faculty to review the outline of each program to determine if, in fact, students are being asked to exhibit certain skills and/or knowledge which they will only acquire in subsequent or concurrent courses.

Recommendation 3 - Prerequisite Basic Skills

Faculty members, in conjunction with Division Heads and resource people, should determine if developmental studies courses should be prerequisites for their courses or if those developmental studies courses can be taken concurrently.

Rationale:

First, TC3 has made a commitment to direct instruction of basic skills. Students with basic skills deficiencies should not be enrolled in courses which assume certain skills before the students have learned them. It is critical that the determination of need be accurate and based on comprehensive testing, and that the appropriate standards of prerequisites exist. These standards should be developed by those faculty members and the Division Head for the course area in which the basic skill is considered prerequisite.

Recommendation 4 - Basic Skills Resources

TC3 needs to make a commitment to its faculty by providing resource personnel who are professionally trained and who have expertise in reading, writing, and math across the curriculum so that faculty can reinforce the student's basic skills in their courses. For example, resource personnel could help faculty create instructional strategies for incorporating basic skills in their courses, create models for term papers, as well as help them select textbooks with regard to the reading ability of their students.

Rationale:

First, developing basic skills across the curriculum is an effective approach for reinforcing basic skills in all content courses. In addition, faculty will have identified the basic skills tasks in their courses; yet, they may feel their instruction in accomplishing these tasks is beyond their field of expertise and thus, will appreciate having the resource personnel. Finally, because the College has made a commitment to basic skills development, and the institution expects that all of its graduates possess a level of basic skills competency, all courses that a student experiences should in some way evaluate, test, and simultaneously develop the student's basic skills. In order to do this, resource personnel are necessary to assist content area faculty in developing appropriate training and experiences for students to shape their basic skills ability.

Recommendation 5 - Master Syllabus

Each course offered by TC3 must have on file in the Dean's Office an official master syllabus containing the following information:

- A. Course description/content outline (list of major topics and course prerequisites).
- B. Terminal course objectives (expected outcomes).
- C. Appropriate methods for evaluating student performance in the discipline.

- D. Requirements for satisfactory completion of the course.
- E. Instruction modes and strategies that might be used in that particular course.
- F. Required texts and bibliography, if appropriate.
- G. Minimum basic skills expectations of students.

This syllabus will be created by a designated, primary instructor in collaboration with the other individuals teaching the course. It will be reviewed annually and revised if necessary. It is the responsibility of the Division Head to review individual course outlines to ensure that there is consistency with the official syllabus.

Rationale:

An official syllabus promotes consistency [particularly in course content,] between the multiple sections of a course, and is a basis for academic standards. The official syllabus is the proper tool to maintain such consistency since it reflects consensus among involved faculty and academic administrators.

Recommendation 6 - Course Outline

Each instructor will deliver a course outline to each student no later than the end of the first week of classes. This outline will contain specific information about the topics to be covered as well as the expectations of that instructor, and will be consistent with the official syllabus. At least the following information must be included:

- A. Course prerequisites.
- B. Minimal basic skills needed to complete course successfully.
- C. Course content presented in units or segments.
- D. Course objectives.
- E. Modalities to be used in the class and alternative learning strategies where appropriate.
- F. Required readings, presentations, written assignments, etc.
- G. Required texts and bibliography for optional, additional reading, if appropriate.
- H. Attendance policy, particularly as it affects grading.
- I. Evaluation policy, and process to be used, including policy for make-up or missed exams, assignments, etc.
- J. Faculty availability, listing office hours, room number and extension number.
- K. Student responsibilities, especially with regard to course requirements.
- L. Additional resource assistance for that course.

Rationale:

The course outline provides the students with the information to determine if they are capable of succeeding in this class;

it becomes a yardstick by which the students judge their own performance as the semester progresses. This document must be derived directly from the official course syllabus.

Recommendation 7 - Evaluation Practices

1. Evaluation will be designed to measure the student's degree of accomplishment in meeting stated course objectives.
2. The instructor will select those evaluation practices which, in his opinion, best measure student progress in the course. These evaluation practices will be specified in the course outline for each section.
3. All stated evaluation practices must be applied consistently to all students.
4. Appropriate evaluation practices might include:
 - A. Written tests, either objective or essay.
 - B. Final Exams - written or oral.
 - C. Oral Exams - other than finals.
 - D. Papers - for example, term papers, book reviews, article reviews, compositions.
 - E. Completion of all assignments, including outside readings in the text, and in other books, either on reserve or articles to be researched.
 - F. Laboratory reports.
 - G. Projects - for example, speeches, art work, drawings.
 - H. Skill measurement (attainment of skills level).
 - I. Class participation.
 - J. Attendance.

Other practices may be used if they measure learning or activities pertinent to the course.

Rationale:

1. All student performance should be measured in relation to the expectations of that course in terms of skills and knowledge identified as the realm of that course.
2. Faculty members exclusively should determine whether or not a student has achieved success in that course.
3. Evaluation techniques must be consistent with the expectations previously identified in the official course syllabus and restated in the official course outline.
4. It is absolutely imperative, regardless of whatever evaluation process is utilized, that students all be evaluated in a consistent and equal manner. This does not preclude faculty from developing optional and extra credit assignments if, [from the very beginning of the course,] all students are provided with the same achievement opportunity.

Special considerations are not to be given to any students unless the option is available to all students. It is important that faculty members clearly articulate in their course outlines any exceptional processes by which a student can improve a grade and any other factors that may affect a student's evaluation. It is understood that all students will receive fair, unbiased treatment with regard to student evaluation.

Recommendation 8 - Grading Policies

1. Whatever combination of evaluation practices is used, the portion of the final grade assigned to each practice must be specified in the course outline.
2. The grading policy for individual sections of courses shall be translated to the institutional grading system in the course outline.

Rationale:

1. So that grading and standards are equitably applied to all students, the weighting of each aspect or component of a student's final grade must be clearly articulated. No modification of this weighting is appropriate unless it is applied consistently to each student and does not create any bias for any group or individual student.
2. Although faculty members' methods of determining grades may vary, we must be consistent and illustrate to students, the consistency and relationship of individual grading systems and practices to the institutional grading system.

Recommendation 9 - The Task Force Supports the Principle of Proficiency Exams and Recommends the following:

The Task Force supports the principle of proficiency exams and recommends the following:

1. Proficiency examinations at TC3 should test for all major subject areas covered in the regular course. When appropriate, the test questions should be divided into two categories: theoretical and practical.
2. The College will grant credit, valid at TC3 only, to those matriculated students whose scores on local proficiency exams indicate mastery of course material.
3. The College shall maintain the complete file of master copies of all proficiency exams in the Word Processing Center where copies of all other tests and exams are on file.

4. Each division offering proficiency exams shall appoint a committee of at least three persons to review current proficiency exams and new exam proposals and to establish a procedure for such a review (and, if necessary, updating) every two years. This committee shall recommend approval or rejection of specific proficiency exams to the Dean of Academic Affairs. In addition, the reviewing committee shall also assess the reliability and validity of the exams after they are administered.
5. Each division offering proficiency exams shall provide a student information sheet for each examination which will list the topics to be covered on the exam as well as an explanation of the evaluation standard and the specific type of award to be granted on the basis of the test results (e.g., pass - waive course requirements).

Rationale:

It is essential that proficiency exams be reliable and valid tests of knowledge where the level of expertise for success is as close as possible to the level of expertise demanded for success in the course environment.

Recommendation 10 - Adding A Course

After the first full week of classes (pro-rated for nonsemester courses) the student who wishes to enter a course MUST obtain the written signature of the instructor who teaches the course. The instructor shall also maintain the right not to add any student after the first week if he believes that such an addition would compromise the quality of the student's academic experience of the course. Furthermore, a student may not add a course after the first three weeks of the course without the permission of the Academic Dean. Finally, the instructor's admission policy should be the same for all students and consistent with the requirements of the instructor's attendance policy.

Rationale:

Many instructors present the foundations of their courses to their students in the first weeks of the semester. Many times these foundations cannot be adequately made up outside of class. Thus, the late student never receives a fair chance to grasp the material. In addition, the presence of floundering late students often poses serious problems for the progress of the class as a group and lessens its morale. Only if he feels that he can overcome these obstacles should a faculty member consent to a late addition.

Recommendation 11 - Elimination of Y Grade

Eliminate the Y grade for nonattendance and give an NC to nonattending students who have not availed themselves of, or qualified for other grade options such as the W or I.

Rationale:

Initially the Y grade was created to maintain an internal record of students who were "failing" a course because of lack of attendance. It is evident from four years of review of the use of this grade that there are a variety of standards by which the Y is given, and regardless of its intent, the outcome is the same; the student has not successfully mastered the course material because of failure to be involved in it. The student should be penalized if he/she has not gone through the appropriate process necessary to withdraw. Unfortunately, use and abuse of the Y is rampant in our grading system and grossly misleading. The award of an NC is an appropriate grade for a student who fails to pursue the course objectives and doesn't accept the responsibility to withdraw. In addition, when the Y grade was initiated, one objective was to be able to determine how many students failed due to nonattendance. However, it has never been used in that way.

Recommendation 12 - Course Withdrawal

The designation of a W shall be granted until the end of the ninth week of class (pro-rated for nonsemester classes). After the ninth week through the end of the semester, a student should receive a WP or an NC depending upon his status in the course at the time of withdrawal. The designation of WP and W will not count in the QPI calculation.

Rationale:

In the current practice which allows for W's up through the 14th week of the semester the W's are too often misleading of a student's actual progress in the course. The W currently can also become an extremely punitive designation with regard to academic difficulty and the Dean's list. Allowing students to withdraw without question through the ninth week gives them ample opportunity to determine whether or not they are going to make satisfactory progress in the class and not be penalized for it.

Recommendation 13 - Final Exams

For those faculty choosing to give a final exam:

1. A final exam period of no less than 3 full days will be scheduled after the instructional period ends for each full semester. Examinations given during the last week of the semester which replace scheduled class time, must be scheduled for no longer than the duration of a typical class period.

Opportunity must be provided for faculty who believe it is appropriate to assess the cumulative knowledge of their students in the context of an examination which may take longer to complete than a typical class period.

2. In those multi-section courses where final examinations are part of the evaluation practice, a common final examination for all sections of the same course is encouraged. As another option, at least some portion of the final examination might be common to all sections; the balance of the examination would reflect different levels of emphasis, style, and grading methodology.

Rationale:

Consistency of student evaluation must be based primarily on the official course syllabus. At the same time we must recognize the diverse and unique styles and methodologies used by our faculty and accept some flexibility in the final examination.

Recommendation 14 - Retention of Plus and Minus Grading System

Retain the present plus and minus grading system.

Rationale:

The committee felt that 4.3 or A+ is an excessive illustration of a student's achievement and that the current system is satisfactory to indicate the higher level of student achievement, since the 4.0 is the most normally acceptable designation of outstanding student success.

Recommendation 15 - NC Included in Computation of QPI

The NC grade will be included as yielding zero quality points in the calculation of the student's QPI.

Rationale:

There are many opportunities for a student to avoid the penalty of an NC grade; thus the inclusion of it in the final QPA reflects the student's failure to have acted in a positive way to resolve the difficulty that he was facing. Thus the consequence of this passivity and inaction should be felt. Also, the College's belief in "demonstrable growth" is also relevant here since the relativity of the NC grade yielding zero quality points clearly illustrates the student's failure to achieve any demonstrable growth in that particular course. Finally, the NC grade forces faculty to make clearer judgments on achievement, which may well improve the quality of their academic standards, and avoid grade inflation. Under current policy, a faculty

member can more easily penalize a student by giving him a D-grade which does count toward QPI. If, in fact, the student has not exercised the appropriate options of withdrawal or request for an incomplete grade then he should receive the appropriate grade, and this grade should reflect in ultimate index of student performance, the QPI.

Recommendation 16 - Transcript as Permanent Record

Current policy on deleting grades on transcripts will be modified to allow for the inclusion of all grades with the exception of I's, IP's, and legitimate clerical errors.

Rationale:

Current practice is misleading to those who review transcripts, because the student's total academic experience is not represented. If the institution believes in "demonstrable growth," then the only way growth and demonstration of it can be noted is to display total student progress.

Recommendation 17 - Repeating Courses

The most recent grade shall be included in the final QPI for any repeated courses.

Rationale:

The Task Force agrees a student should be allowed to repeat a course in order to improve the grade, but at the same time, the student should recognize that repeating a course can affect his overall QPI. Without this policy, students can repeat a course, receive a lower grade because of lack of motivation or disinterest, and end up not being affected at all by that poor performance. If a student chooses to repeat a course to improve the grade, it should be with the risk that the most recent grade will be the one that counts in the student's QPI. If a student officially withdraws, not passing from a course prior to the completion of the semester, he receives a "designation" of withdrawal and not a "grade." Therefore the "grade" in the previous course holds. In other words, the most recent grade counting toward QPI will be the grade which counts. One should also keep in mind Recommendation 16 where it states that all grades regardless of the number of times of repetition will be maintained on the transcript.

Recommendation 18 - Academic Warning System

As part of the advising function, the Task Force believes it is to the advantage of the student to be notified when his academic performance falls below a satisfactory level. This notification process will take place at both the course and program levels. A Course Academic Warning system is already in place. A Program Academic Warning system will operate as follows:

Evaluation of academic progress will be made at the end of each semester, but no notification will be sent to the student until he has completed at least twelve semester credits. At that point an academic review will be made of any student who does not appear to be maintaining the minimum QPI.

Academic progress is defined as follows:

<u>No. of hours completed</u>	<u>Minimum QPI</u>
12 - 36	1.8
37 and above	2.0

Any student who falls below the minimum QPI as stated above will receive an academic warning letter from the Dean of Students. The student who receives this warning will be encouraged to seek instructional and counseling assistance.

If a student receives two academic warning letters, the Dean of Students will ask an academic review committee to recommend a course of action which might help the student to improve his academic standing or assist the student in reassessing his educational goals. These recommendations may include:

1. Placing the student on academic probation by limiting his course load to the hours which would best suit his individual needs.
2. Recommending to the student that he take a leave of absence for a semester or two and encouraging him to work with the Counseling Office to identify problem areas affecting educational progress.
3. Other recommendations or actions which seem appropriate to the academic review committee when there are mitigating circumstances. The purpose of any recommendation would be to offer support and encouragement to the student who is in academic difficulty, even to the point of recommending that he withdraw from the College.

Rationale:

Students need to be apprised of their academic status and their long-term chances for financial aid and graduation. This system will clarify the importance of academic pursuits at TC3 and, at the same time, show the student that the institution cares about his success by recommending a more reasonable course of study and places where he may receive help.

Recommendation 19 - Consistency of Program Graduation Requirements

Division Heads will meet with faculty and verify that all program requirements for graduation are consistent with College Policy and clarify any unique standards for graduation.

Rationale:

Unless individual program requirements for graduation are clearly stated and consistent with College graduation policy, students may fail to fulfill them, challenge their fairness, and receive waivers. In so doing they will lessen the quality of their academic experience by eliminating requirements which faculty strongly endorsed in their program. Additionally, by encouraging those waivers, inconsistent program requirements make graduation requirements much more arbitrary and thus less uniformly fair.

Recommendation 20 - Program Re-Entry

Any matriculated student who re-enters the College after an absence of two consecutive full semesters (not including summer school) should have the approval of the Dean of Academic Affairs to re-enter his original program.

Rationale:

Students who seek to re-enter programs which have been changed or even deleted may encounter difficulty in meeting the original requirements. It would be to the student's benefit to receive counsel about his educational goals. The Academic Dean is the appropriate person to determine whether or not the program is a viable option for the student.

WPC/pc/MC/P

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC[®] CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

MAY 8 7 1982